

MINUTES

Eugene Budget Committee
Downtown Library, Bascom-Tykeson Room
100 West Tenth Street

May 1, 2006
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Bob Peters, Chair; John Barofsky, Bonny Bettman, Mike Biglan, Mike Clark, John Demboski, David Kelly, Terry McDonald, George Poling, Andrea Ortiz, Gary Papé, Chris Pryor, Jana Rygas, Jennifer Solomon, Claire Syrett, Betty Taylor, George Poling, Andrea Ortiz, members; Mayor Kitty Piercy; City Manager Dennis Taylor; Assistant City Manager Jim Carlson; Kitty Murdoch, Dee Ann Hardt, Central Services Department; Susan Muir, Planning and Development Department; Chief Tom Tallon, Fire & EMS Department.

Mr. Peters called the meeting of the Budget Committee to order.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

Marshall Peter, 2602 Agate Street, asked the committee to increase funding levels for the Human Services Commission to supplant lost Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds.

John Erickson, 66 East 6th Avenue, asked the committee to fully fund the Downtown Guides. He spoke of the professionalism of the guides in coping with the mentally ill and those with drug addictions, assisting tourists and helping them to feel safe.

Erin Rumer, 1150 Goodpasture Island Road, spoke of the benefits of audible pedestrian signals to Eugene residents who were visually impaired and her own experience in trying to cross Goodpasture Island Road. She said the signals would increase the independence and safety of the visually impaired.

Scott Olmos, 3765 Meadowview Drive, President of the Eugene Firefighters Association, expressed support for Mr. Poling's proposal to fund a 24-hour staffed ambulance in the budget. He said that Eugene had three 24-hour medic units, which was the same as Springfield. While units were strategically staffed, at peak times the high volume of medical times often required the Danebo fire engine to be shut down so an additional medic unit could be staffed. He thought that compromised the safety of both citizens and firefighters. He described the current mutual response system and suggested that outside agencies were reaping the financial benefits of Eugene's understaffed medic services. He said the union felt the proposal met a significant need. He urged support of the proposal using General Fund resources.

Mary Otten, 1612 Lincoln Street, emphasized the importance of the audible pedestrian devices. She submitted a revised list of signal locations, noting the list had been reviewed and was supported by Tom Larson of the Public Works staff. There was no increase in cost. She asked the committee to consider funding the signals not paid for by Community Development Block Grant funds or Lane Transit District. She also recommended an ongoing program similar to that used to locate curb cuts be established.

Zach Vishanoff, a resident who lived on Patterson Street, made remarks critical of Mr. Kelly's position on several recent council issues as he considered them in opposition to the neighborhood initiative. He questioned the motive behind the budget allocation for the initiative, suggesting the initiative was intended to stifle rather than foster communication with the neighborhoods. He opposed the allocation. Mr. Vishanoff requested an allocation for the current tenants of Westmoreland Student Housing "should they

be put on the street” by University President David Frohnmayer.

Carlos Barrera, 2470 Olive Street, urged funding for more audible pedestrian signals and for full funding for the neighborhood matching grants program. He said that the signals served not just the visually impaired, but those with other impairments as well. The matching grants program helped to get neighbors involved in their neighborhood association.

Sharon Chamberlain, 1966 Garden Avenue, representing the HIV Alliance, shared an anecdote about a client who had tested positive for HIV and then had gone to work helping others with HIV. She asked the committee to increase funding to the Safe and Sound Program to increase HIV testing on high-risk homeless youth.

Charles Biggs, 540 Antelope Way, reviewed the history of the neighborhood matching grants program and advocated for its restoration. He shared examples of successful projects funded through the program.

Rob Handy, 455-1/2 River Road, represented the Neighborhood Leaders Council (NLC), and advocated for an additional \$50,000 for the neighborhood matching grants program and reestablishment of the Citizen Involvement Committee at the council-adopted service level (\$40,000). He also noted the NLC’s support for funding additional audible pedestrian signals and funding to complete the South Ridgeline Study.

Majeska Seese Green, PO Box 1214, represented the Whiteaker Community Council and spoke in support of a quiet zone along the railroad tracks in downtown Eugene. She said that residents frequently raised the issue of train noise as a quality of life problem and Ms. Green believed it discouraged people from living in the Whiteaker neighborhood and downtown. She commended the work of Traffic Engineer Tom Larson in regard to the issue.

Janet Marshall-O’Bryant, 85 North Madison Street, represented the Whiteaker Community Council and spoke in support of a quiet zone along the railroad tracks. She expressed concern about the effect of train noise on community health. She reported that the Federal Railroad Administration now allowed train whistles to be retro-fitted to 110 decibels, which had a serious negative effect on community livability and property values. She indicated that in many cases, the costs of implementing safety and quiet measures could be shared.

Mara Wile, 3470 High Street, asked the committee to support a request sent by the River Road and Santa Clara community organizations for use of the remaining sewer bond funds. The money would be used to continue to produce and mail newsletters and to underwrite the costs of a neighborhood planning effort guided by members of the two organizations.

Mr. Peters noted that the public comment period had reached its conclusion and determined there was unanimous support for continuing the item.

David Hinkley, 1350 Lawrence Street, #1, representing the Neighborhood Leaders Council, provided some history about the neighborhood matching grants program and requested that the program be budgeted above and beyond what was already allocated to it through the neighborhood initiative.

John Chapman, 2285 Rose Lane, President of the Board of Directors of the Boys and Girls Club, asked that the City allow the Boys and Girls Club to become one of its contract service providers for after school programming. He said most of the club’s participants were low-income or from single-parent families. The club provided daily after school programming and in-service day and holiday programming to allow parents to go to work. Participants paid \$20 annually and some paid less. He noted that the club was largely operated by volunteers.

Jennifer Wassmiller, 2100 Tyler Street, supported the funding request from the Boys and Girls Club, noting her own children's participation in the club. One of her children was enrolled in the Exclusive Child Care Program co-sponsored by the club, which provided parents of a child with a disability with a subsidy to help them secure the child care provider of their choice. Her children participated in many enjoyable activities, met many new friends, and received strong emotional support from the staff. She said the program provided her with quality child care at a price she could afford.

Debi Farr, 1929 Praslin Street, advocated for funding of the improvements needed at Golden Gardens Park. She thanked Ms. Solomon for her leadership on the issue. Ms. Farr noted the four deaths that had occurred over the past twelve years, and emphasized that real people and real families were impacted. She asked that improvements to the park be moved "to the top of the list" before another death occurred.

Shawna Davis, 2350 North Terry Street, advocated for City funding for swimming lessons for all third-grade children. She emphasized the support and compassion the community shared to the families who experienced personal tragedy because of the deaths at Golden Gardens Ponds. She advocated for a feasibility study and funding to acquire the extra acreage needed to slope the ponds to create safer conditions.

Ruth Anne Paul, 1475 Green Acres Road, shared the concerns expressed by others regarding Golden Gardens Park and advocated for funding the improvements needed to make the ponds more safe. She believed that the conditions that existed at Golden Gardens Park would not have been allowed to go on so long at other parks in other parts of the city. She said the park was a beautiful asset and the City should take care of it.

Mary Monette, 3261 Richard Street, discussed recent activities of the Friends of Golden Gardens Park. She anticipated the committee would soon hear some good news from a classroom at Prairie Mountain School in regard to several projects at Golden Gardens Park. Outreach to neighbors was occurring and a neighborhood watch was being contemplated. The friends were working with the Active Bethel Citizens to include information about the park in the neighborhood newsletter in an attempt to build neighborhood pride in the park.

Diane Shock, Barger Drive, thanked the committee for existing efforts but said more was needed. She advocated for funding for a feasibility study and subsequent implementation actions, including land acquisition to create space to slope the sides of the ponds, trout stocking, walking trails, rest rooms, and an emergency call box. She supported the provision of free swimming lessons for all third graders.

II. MINUTES APPROVAL

Mr. Peters noted the electronic distribution of the February 21, 2006, minutes, and determined there were no corrections.

Mr. Poling, seconded by Mr. Papé, moved to approve the minutes of February 21, 2006, as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

III. DISCUSSION OF THE FY07 PROPOSED OPERATING BUDGET

Mr. Peters reviewed the list of motions to be considered and called on committee members to discuss the motions they intended to offer the body.

Ms. Bettman reviewed her motion, which was that, in lieu of a library local option levy, the committee fund Library services and operations with \$2,107,000 from the annual revenue available due to retirement rate reductions instead of the proposed discretionary service additions to the General Fund. She clarified that was excluding from the number the funding of \$1.312 million in public safety and the \$1.23 million from other funds. In addition, she proposed to use \$2 million in additional capacity in the Reserve for Revenue Shortfall and noted the \$700,000 already allocated to the library in the General Fund. She suggested the remaining \$200,000 could come from the difference between projected and actual revenues.

Ms. Bettman said that her proposal still left \$16 million on the table that could be amortized at the rate of \$2 million annually to selectively pay for some of the General Fund additions. She said the budget was healthy due to past fiscal constraint, and the committee should not abandon that philosophy now. She believed the committee's top priority was funding existing services through the General Fund before adding new services.

Mr. Kelly applauded Ms. Bettman's goal and expressed appreciation to staff for the General Funds that had been allocated in the budget. He asked staff if the two funding sources Ms. Bettman referred to were the same source.

City Manager Dennis Taylor clarified that the \$700,000 referred to by Mr. Kelly was not in the fiscal year 2007 budget, but rather he proposed to continue the last year of the levy. He recalled that the multi-year financial plan recommended that beginning in fiscal year 2008, \$700,000 be included in the General Fund for the library. He confirmed that the \$700,000 that staff proposed in order to make the library levy smaller was intended to come from the fiscal year 2008 budget.

Assistant City Manager Carlson indicated that the Reserve for Revenue Shortfall was a one-time reserve that could be used once. It was projected to hold steady at the level of about \$7.5 million in the out-years. Decreasing it by \$2 million annually would eventually exhaust the fund.

Mr. Kelly asked Ms. Bettman to provide the committee with her recommendations about other General Fund additions she would remove from the proposed budget before May 15.

Mr. Barofsky shared Ms. Bettman's philosophy regarding the funding of ongoing services but indicated he could be flexible in how that occurred. He would like to work toward that goal if other committee members shared the sentiment. He said the next measure might pass, but it was impossible to know what a subsequent measure would be up against.

Responding to a question from Mr. Barofsky, Ms. Muir indicated that the funding budgeted for downtown development was intended to come from revenue from projects as they materialized.

Mr. Papé asked when the manager anticipated the library would be fully funded by the General Fund or funding other than the serial bond. City Manager Taylor recalled the Multi-Year Financial Plan proposed to add \$700,000 in fiscal year 2008 in annualized funding. The cost of the library was \$5 million annually, and he did not think it could be sustained without a new source of revenue. For that reason, he recommended renewal of the limited levy, with the anticipation that ways would be found to reduce reliance on the bond over time. The City could choose not to levy the bond in a particular year after it was approved.

Mr. Papé requested a funding scenario for the library that did not depend on the bond measure. City Manager Taylor determined that Mr. Papé wanted to see the reductions that would be necessary to fund the library in fiscal year 2007. He noted that it would require \$4 million in General Fund reductions to fund the library in FY07, and he would not recommend basing a budget on a scenario that would be produced in such a short time. He recommended instead directing staff to produce the scenario for the following budget year.

Mr. Papé questioned what would happen if the bond measure failed.

Mr. McDonald asked why the manager did not propose to use the three percent assessment increase in the property tax assessment and increase in the base, which he perceived as new money, to fund the library. City Manager Taylor indicated his recommendations had been focused on the council's priorities and the deficits that existed in the public safety service area. He had also considered service areas with grant funding and work load increases, including the library itself. His recommendations were also informed by two council work sessions at which the bond measure had been discussed, and a council majority adopted a motion to place the subject of the bond measure on the council schedule for referral to the voters.

Assistant City Manager Carlson observed that the three-percent increase in assessed value allowed the City to maintain the current service system due to increases in labor contracts and materials. He said that new development, which provided an overall growth in revenues, provided a bit of increment over the cost of living, but some of that went to offset flat revenue sources, such as State shared revenues, which had not increased in many years.

Mr. McDonald acknowledged labor costs were the City's largest cost, but it was not at 100 percent of the budget, whereas the increase in the tax base was 100 percent increase; logic then dictated there should be more funds available than the incremental 2.2 percent. He suggested it would be wise to consider a back-up or incremental strategy that identified how the City would include the library in the General Fund. City Manager Taylor concurred that was a reasonable strategy, but pointed to significant increases the City expected in public safety, and said he was attempting to create a balance. He asked if the committee was willing to trade the library levy for a public safety levy in the future.

Mr. McDonald believed the community would like to see a backup strategy.

Mr. Pryor pointed that no one believed that ongoing serial levies was the answer to library funding, and he suspected all shared the same goal. The issue was how quickly to do it and how to do it. He said if there was no interest in the serial levy, the City would have to figure how out to "eat the elephant in one bite," and it was a pretty big bite. Funding the library to avoid a serial levy could be difficult to accomplish.

Mr. Pryor said there were many ideas being circulated and he would like to know the impact of some of the ideas that had been put forth. He asked if it was possible for staff to identify potential services areas for reduction and that impact without taking too much time. He suggested that if the council was to go to voters with the serial levy, it be clear this was the last such levy and council would work to reduce it to make a minimal amount.

Ms. Rygas believed a plan for the future was needed if another serial levy was offered the voters. She said it did not appear the current plan did that. She wanted to know the impacts of bringing the library into the General Fund over a period of years.

Ms. Rygas suggested that staff was being overly conservative in its projections for the Unappropriated Ending Fund Balance (UEFB), and suggested that there could be another source of funding for the library. City Manager Taylor noted the one-time nature of those funds.

Mr. Peters noted the council's action on the serial levy and upcoming action on May 8, acknowledging it did not commit the council to the levy. He suggested the committee's discussion could help inform that decision.

Speaking to City Manager Taylor's response to Ms. Rygas question about the UEFB, Mr. Kelly suggested that one-time money that appeared each year was really ongoing money. He thought a discussion of

whether the Ending Unallocated Fund Balance in the General Fund was higher than it needed to be. City Manager Taylor indicated staff could provide an analysis of that topic.

Mr. Kelly pointed out that the motion would not impact the FY07 budget because the current levy ran through the coming fiscal year. Passage of the motion would be direction for the construction of the FY08 budget. City Manager Taylor concurred.

Ms. Bettman said the council's motion related to the serial levy was not informed by the budget, as it was yet to be proposed, and the council did not know what revenue would be available. She said that while Mr. Kelly was right, the budget before the committee was impacted, as it included at least \$5 million in new added services. Those would have to be reprioritized according to the calculation she offered the committee.

Mr. Papé shared Ms. Rygas' interest in knowing the impact of adding the library back to the General Fund over a period of years, suggesting that would help to garner public support for a serial levy.

In response to Mr. Kelly's earlier question, Assistant City Manager Jim Carlson clarified that the \$2.107 million and \$2 million referred to by Ms. Bettman were the same money. He referred to information provided to the committee that provided a breakdown of the additions and separated the one-time expenditures from the ongoing expenditures, and said the manager proposed to add \$2.6 million to all General Fund services. If the committee eliminated all the additions, some of which involved existing services such as the Lane Regional Air Protection Agency contract, and added the \$700,000 proposed to be added to the General Fund for the library in FY08, it would still be \$1.7 million short of funding the library. That would have to come from the current service system to fully fund the library. Assistant City Manager Carlson said that if the levy failed in November, it would be before work began on the FY08 budget. If the levy failed, he speculated the City would have to close the branches, because they were completed funded by the levy.

Ms. Rygas questioned whether the additions were more valuable than speeding up the process of putting the library in the General Fund. She suggested that the one-time moneys available to the committee be used to do so. She said that Assistant City Manager Carlson's remarks showed that the City would find a way to fund the library, which she maintained "really kinds of breaks trust with the voters" since the council was putting out a levy and in fact, there was a way to fund the library anyway. She said the committee should look for that way as fast as possible, and if not this, in the next two years.

Mr. Barfosky clarified with City Manager Taylor that the \$2 million Ms. Bettman referred to included \$500,000 in savings from retiring the \$7.7 million in PERS. City Manager Taylor added that would be there if the City retired the bonds during FY07, beginning in FY08. He confirmed that was included in the assumptions in the multi-year forecast. Mr. Barofsky said that if the City retained the \$10.4 million in reserves and did not retire the \$7.7 million, the \$2 million referred to by Ms. Bettman was actually \$1.5 million.

Ms. Bettman said she never claimed to be a math expert. She believed the committee could examine the proposed additions from the other funds. Ms. Bettman said the council would either seek a levy or not. She suggested it could be constructed to be \$3.2 million the first year, to slowly decline to zero in the last year. Ms. Bettman believed it was disingenuous to go to the voters with a serial levy saying it was the last time when the budget picture was as good as the committee had seen.

Mr. Peters called for a motion to extend the time to allow Ms. Bettman to complete her remarks.

Mr. McDonald, seconded by Mr. Kelly, moved to extend time for Ms. Bettman to complete her remarks. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Bettman warned the committee that it was dangerous to direct staff to produce a reduction scenario, asserting that the cuts it would offer would be the most onerous and everyone would panic, and there would be insufficient time for discussion. She said the UEFB for FY05 was 7.2 percent or \$6.8 million, and given the larger budget for FY07 the committee could expect more. She believed that there was money available to fund the library. Ms. Bettman said that going to the public at the beginning of the process and saying that the City was doing really well had gotten everyone's expectations up. She said that the City used to be able to request approval of serial levies on the basis it did not have enough money; now the City was telling the community about the rosy budget picture and asking it to pass a serial levy. She did not think that the right approach.

Mr. Papé reiterated his interest in the information requested by Ms. Rygas before the council took action on May 8.

Mr. Kelly pointed out to Ms. Bettman that under council policy, the UEFB must contain enough money to pay two months of City operating expenses. The council would have to revisit that issue if the committee elected to use that resource.

Ms. Ortiz proposed the remaining River Road/Santa Clara sewer fund balance allocate \$120,000 for additional production and distribution of newsletters, with the remainder to be put in a fund for community outreach, neighborhood planning, and implementation projects initiated and recommended by the River Road and Santa Clara community organizations. She added the caveat that any recommendations of the organizations must be approved by the City Council.

Mr. Papé expressed support, although he was concerned about the lack of funding from Lane County, which represented some of the areas in question. He suggested that the City and community organizations go to Lane County to seek assistance for newsletter funding.

Mr. Barfosky supported the additional funding for newsletters proposal and indicated he had no position on the remainder of the proposal at this time.

Mr. Kelly also supported the additional funding for newsletters and was inclined to support the allocation proposed for the remainder of the funding with the caveat mentioned by Ms. Ortiz. He said the neighborhood organizations should not take committee approval of the funding as council approval of a plan. He also wanted to ensure that City staff participated in any discussions as a stakeholder, which increased the likelihood a plan would be accepted by the council.

Ms. Ortiz concurred with Mr. Kelly as to staff involvement.

Assistant City Manager Carlson indicated that the committee did not have to change the budget, and the record would reflect its legislative intent regarding the allocation of funds.

Responding to a question from Ms. Bettman about other uses for the money, Assistant City Manager Carlson said that it could be directed to the General Fund and used for any lawful purpose.

Responding to a question from Mr. Barfosky, Mr. Kelly said that he anticipated the cost of City staff could be absorbed in the current budget, or staff would let the committee know.

Mr. McDonald expressed concern about creating an expectation of longer term funding without sure expectation the money would be available. Ms. Ortiz believed the neighborhood organizations were aware of the limited nature of the funding. She advocated for the funding on the basis that it would help improve communication between the City and residents of the unincorporated areas of River Road and Santa Clara.

She agreed that Lane County should contribute to the cost of newsletters and she committed to working on that issue. Mr. McDonald believed that the committee needed to find a way to build those costs into the budget.

The committee took a brief meeting break.

Mr. Poling discussed a motion he intended to offer the committee to add funding to the budget to underwrite the costs of a 24-hour medic unit to Fire Station 8. While he thought Fire Chief Tom Tallon was doing a good job overall in providing services, he believed that growth in the area justified the addition of the service. He said the City should not leave a piece of equipment unmanned given the call levels and types of calls the department was starting to see. He proposed to increase the Fire and Emergency Medical Services budget by \$827,238 to staff a paramedic unit on a 24-hour basis, which required a total of six paramedics for three shifts. In future years the ongoing cost would be \$796,238. That funding would come from the UEFB, the \$2.1 million realized from the PERS reforms, or a reduction in the additions to the General Fund budget.

Ms. Ortiz agreed that Chief Tallon was doing a good job in providing services, but she was not going to support any additional funding for the department until the chief provided a plan to diversify the work force. She had yet to see such a plan.

Mr. Kelly concurred with the remarks of Ms. Ortiz. While he understood the challenges faced by the department, he was disappointed by the lack of diversity in the department work force and what appeared to be any direction to change that.

Responding to a question from Mr. Kelly, Chief Tallon confirmed that the Fire Station 3 in the University area had the same staffing levels as Fire Station 8. Mr. Kelly suggested that if Fire Station 8 was inadequate, so was the staffing at Fire Station 3. He asked if that station was the biggest problem, and where the gaps existed. Chief Tallon said the City's Standards of Response Coverage, which employed scientific measurements, were used to determine how services were distributed throughout the system. He said that he had not proposed the addition being proposed by Mr. Poling as the department did not see it as critical at this point.

Chief Tallon reviewed the factors behind the existing system of deployment and emphasized the importance of the flexibility it provided.

Chief Tallon thanked Mr. Poling for his interest and the committee for its past funding. He said it was hard to argue that the additions of paramedics would not make the community safer, because it would. He anticipated that at some point, a future fire chief, employing the standards of coverage, would be before the committee indicating the level of risk was sufficiently high to justify the hiring of more fire fighters and paramedics. He said that the department was examining transport because unit-hour use was high and it was placing stress on the fire fighter-paramedics. Chief Tallon proposed to address that through increasing hours of the dynamic units. However, he did not think the numbers justified the addition being proposed now.

Chief Tallon also expressed concern about the potential of mixing General Fund and Enterprise Fund dollars as it had the potential of allowing future decision makers to make unsustainable decisions about the rates charged for transport.

Chief Tallon acknowledged the comments of Ms. Ortiz and Mr. Kelly on diversity and agreed as to the importance of the issue. He said that it was also a complex issue. He noted that most fire fighters had an associate's degree, and he had worked with targeted groups to seek funding for programs aimed at those groups and found the money was very limited and that there were few ideas for increasing minority and

women fire fighters, other than early outreach to schools. He continued to work on the issue with City staff and members of the public. He took Ms. Ortiz's remarks very seriously, and said he would request her help in diversifying the work force so it mirrored the community it served.

Ms. Bettman said that she wanted improved service levels but needed a justification for the expenditure. She had not heard from the public regarding the need as she had previously on additions to the department and looked forward to learning more about the proposal.

Mr. McDonald determined from Chief Tallon that the eleven stations each served about 17,000 people. Chief Tallon did not think the station served more people than other stations. He said that over the last three months, Fire Station 8 was the seventh busiest of the fire stations. He characterized it as a low call-volume station. He shared some statistics regarding volume at Fire Station 8 over the past three months. Chief Tallon noted his recommendation to the executive team for funding for a deputy fire marshal in Fire Prevention; that recommendation had not gone forward, but it would have been his recommendation for any additions.

Mr. McDonald asked questions of Chief Tallon clarifying the current nature of the department work force and the nature of the recruitment done by the department. Mr. McDonald urged Chief Tallon to be more aggressive in its efforts.

Ms. Rygas asked if Chief Tallon had a plan for service delivery as the population grew. Chief Tallon referred Ms. Rygas to the Standards of Response Coverage and offered to provide copies to the citizen members of the committee. He said it was updated annually but clarified it was not specific as to staffing levels; rather, the focus was on risk. He added that he changed the deployment of the department at times in response to changes and needs.

Mr. Pryor introduced an intended motion regarding an increase in funding to the Human Services Fund. He referred the committee to a letter he signed on behalf of the Human Services Commission in his role as chair, which requested that the City increase its contribution above the normal inflationary adjustment by \$40,000 to keep funding levels whole.

Responding to a question from Mr. McDonald, Mr. Pryor indicated that Lane County and Springfield was also being asked to increase its contribution, and he speculated that those entities might take their lead from the City's action as Eugene was considering the issue first. Mr. McDonald determined from Mr. Pryor that about 56 percent of those served were from Eugene, and Eugene contributed about 61 percent of the total.

Mr. McDonald noted the fiscal constraints faced by Springfield and Lane County and questioned whether they would be able to come up with the money. He suggested that Eugene assume a larger funding role. Mr. Pryor believed it best if all jurisdictions contributed to the shortfall. Mr. McDonald said one must rely on the things one can control, and Eugene had a degree of control over its own budget. He preferred to see Eugene assume more of a lead funding role.

Ms. Ortiz urged the committee to support the funding request, saying the fund provided a tangible asset to the community and there was no duplication of services.

Mr. Poling asked what would happen if Lane County and Springfield failed to contribute. He suggested the committee could condition its contribution on restricting services to Eugene residents. Mr. Pryor believed the committee could make that stipulation if it wanted. Mr. Poling suggested stipulating the contribution on contributions from Lane County and Springfield.

Ms. Bettman did not believe the funding for human services had ever been proportionality equal between

the three jurisdictions and asked if there was proportional representation on the Human Services Commission. Mr. Pryor said no. Ms. Bettman believed it should be proportional. She believed that Lane County and Springfield were unlikely to increase their contributions to the amount requested.

Responding to a question from Ms. Bettman, Assistant City Manager Carlson indicated that only 15 percent of the City's Community Development Block Grant funds could be used for social services, and the other 85 percent was dedicated to capital purposes. Ms. Muir indicated she would provide the list of projects considered by the Community Development Block Grant Advisory Committee so the committee could see what projects had been considered.

Responding to a question from Ms. Rygas, Steve Manela, staff of the HSC, indicated that Boys and Girls Club was not funded by the Human Services Fund because it was considered a recreational organization, not a social services organization. For the benefit of Ms. Rygas, he provided an overview of the HSC allocation process.

Responding to a question from Mr. Papé regarding the basis for the request, Mr. Manela said the amounts were based on the block grant dollars being reduced for each jurisdiction. He clarified that Lane County had already committed to increasing its contribution at the level requested.

Mr. Papé asked if it would be fair to state that Springfield and Lane County residents were being subsidized by Eugene's contribution. Mr. Manela said that the County put in excess of \$5 million into health and human services, and a portion of that goes to the Human Services Fund. The County also funded substance abuse and mental health services. The County contributed 31 percent to the fund, and about 19 percent of those served were rural residents. Springfield contributed about 8 percent, and about 25 percent of those served were Springfield residents. Mr. Papé said while he was satisfied with the current system, he was not interested in paying more and would prefer to spend Eugene money on Eugene taxpayers.

Mr. Peters, a member of the HSC, noted the major role of Lane County in regard to provision of social services and said that County representative felt the County contributed more than its share. He said that he would like the committee to discuss the potential of asking those requesting money to make applications for a more systematic approach. Mr. Peters supported the proposed contribution, noting it was supplanting money being eliminated by the federal government.

Ms. Bettman said that in recent years the City's contribution to the fund had remained relatively static. She thought all would agree there was a huge backlog of need in this service area, but it was not easily quantifiable. She wished the City could address the need with more equity. Ms. Bettman noted that the providers were closely tied to the funding process and the providers depended on each other to create the matrix of services.

Mr. McDonald thought it was very difficult to restrict services to Eugene residents, as it forced the HSC to go to the providers and ask them to segregate moneys. He hoped the City did not move in that direction. Mr. Papé said he was merely suggesting that if services were to be delivered collectively, there be collective participation. He pointed out that Eugene residents were also County residents.

Speaking to Ms. Bettman's comments, Ms. Rygas suggested that there must be a way to measure how far behind the community was in terms of meeting human services needs in the community. She pointed out that the City has measures that triggered such things as roof replacement and staffing levels. She acknowledged the exercise might be complex and difficult, but the alternative was that the community never started measuring how far behind it was in terms of needs, and would "never get there."

Mr. Kelly supported the contribution and endorsed the remarks of Ms. Rygas. He solicited suggestions as

to how to create measurements for social services from staff.

Mr. Pryor thanked the committee for its discussion, which he noted paralleled that of the HSC.

Mr. Kelly presented an intended motion to increase funding for the neighborhood initiative to \$150,000 and restore the Citizen Involvement Committee (CIC) at a level of \$40,000. He invited input into the allocation of funds from the citizen members, but reminded members that the council had an existing action plan. He indicated he would likely move to make the funding ongoing given that the costs would be ongoing.

Mr. Barofsky noted the relationship between the intended motion and his intended motion for a one-time allocation of \$150,000 for the matching grants program to be allocated over three years. That would leave the \$100,000 recommended by the City Manager to accomplish other things in the council's action plan.

Mr. McDonald supported the proposal as he thought the neighborhood program was one of the few effective ways to engage citizens meaningfully.

Mr. Peters emphasized the importance of the items under consideration to the Neighborhood Leaders Council. He intended to offer a motion that \$50,000 of the \$100,000 recommended by the City Manager for the neighborhood initiative be allocated to the matching grants program, as well as a separate motion that \$10,000 be added for newsletters. He said the neighborhood associations were very appreciative of the amount the City had allocated, and the additional funding would fund one more newsletter annually.

Ms. Bettman did not value adding the services proposed in Mr. Kelly's intended motion above and beyond funding the library, although she valued them more than some of the proposed additions in the budget. Regarding the suggestion to restore the CIC, she noted her past membership on the CIC and suggested that unless the council was willing to renovate the CIC's mission and bylaws, it was a waste of money to restore the committee. Significant controversial projects bypassed the CIC or were brought to it at the last minute, and the private element of public/private partnerships did not have to respond to requests for information from the CIC. The CIC could not direct the private sector to do what it wanted. She had voted to discontinue the committee although she was a staunch proponent of citizen involvement. She asked if existing planning staff resources now devoted to citizen involvement could be freed up and devoted to the committee if reestablished.

IV. ADJOURN

Mr. Peters adjourned the meeting at 8:58 p.m.

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)